



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/882,409	06/15/2001	Hironori Kobayashi	DAIN:498A	8853

7590 10/07/2005

Parkhurst & Wendel, L.L.P.
Suite 210
1421 Prince Street
Alexandria, VA 22314-2805

EXAMINER

MCPHERSON, JOHN A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1756

DATE MAILED: 10/07/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/882,409

Applicant(s)

KOBAYASHI ET AL.

Examiner

John A. McPherson

Art Unit

1756

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 June 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 82-146, 150-153 and 155-216 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) 83-95, 97-103, 106-113, 116-146, 150-153 and 155-216 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 82, 96, 104, 105, 114 and 115 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 9/9/05.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This Office Action is responsive to the Request for Reconsideration filed 6/30/05.

Double Patenting

2. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 82, 96, 104, 105, 114 and 115 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-24 of U.S. Patent No. 6,450,635 for the reasons of record as set forth in paragraphs 2 of the Office Action dated 8/1/03, and as further discussed below.

3. Claims 104 and 114 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-17 of U.S. Patent No. 6,554,420, filed as copending Application No. 10/142,379 and published as

U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0126194, for the reasons of record as set forth in paragraph 3 of the Office Action dated 8/1/03, and as further discussed below.

4. Claims 104 and 114 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-13 of U.S. Patent No. 6,294,313. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other for the reasons of record as set forth in paragraph 4 of the Office Action mailed 12/30/04, and as further discussed below.

5. Claims 82, 96, 104, 105, 114 and 115 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-14 of U.S. Patent No. 6,650,047. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other for the reasons of record as set forth in paragraph 5 of the Office Action mailed 12/30/04, and as further discussed below.

6. Claims 104 and 114 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-17 of U.S. Patent No. 6,573,650. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other for the reasons of record as set forth in paragraph 6 of the Office Action mailed 12/30/04, and as further discussed below.

7. Claims 82, 96, 104, 105, 114 and 115 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-49 of copending Application No. 10/651,062, published as 2004/0046498. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other for the reasons of record as set forth in paragraph 7 of the Office Action mailed 12/30/04, and as further discussed below.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

8. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 82, 96, 104, 105, 114 and 115 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by GB 1 329 589 [listed on the Information Disclosure Statement filed 10/10/01] (GB '589) for the reasons of record as set forth in paragraphs 2 of the Office Action dated 8/1/03, and as further discussed below.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments filed 6/30/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

With respect to the obvious double patenting rejections over US 6,450,635, US 6,554,420 and 6,294,313, Applicant argues that these rejections are overcome by three Terminal Disclaimers. However, these terminal disclaimers are not signed by an attorney of record.

With respect to the obvious double patenting rejections over 6,650,047, 6,573,650 and 10/651,062, Applicant argues that the photocatalyst-containing layers of these references has a charge-transfer function, while the present invention does not disclose the photocatalyst-containing layer as being a layer having a charge transfer function. However, the presently claimed invention is generic to (i.e. fully encompasses) each of the species claimed in the references.

With respect to the 35 USC 102 rejection over GB '589, Applicant argues that this reference does not show "varying wettability" as a result of "photocatalytic action upon pattern-wise exposure". However, GB '589 discloses a photosensitive material that is hydrophobic when unexposed and hydrophilic when exposed to light, wherein the photosensitive material comprises a radiation-sensitive material such as the metal oxides used as photocatalysts in the present invention. Specifically, GB '589 discloses oxides of zinc, titanium, tin and bismuth (see page 1, lines 81-84), wherein preferably zinc oxide is used as the radiation-sensitive material (page 3, lines 36-38). These materials are disclosed in the present specification as examples of photocatalysts usable in the present invention (e.g. see page 20, lines 23-30).

Conclusion

10. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John A. McPherson whose telephone number is (571) 272-1386. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 8:00 AM to 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark Huff can be reached on (571) 272-1385. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Art Unit: 1756

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



John A. McPherson
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1756

JAM
10/3/05